

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON**

SETH EUGENE LAIZURE,

Plaintiff,

v.

WASHINGTON COUNTY, *et al.*,

Defendant.

Case No. 3:17-cv-1254-SB

ORDER

Michael H. Simon, District Judge.

United States Magistrate Judge Stacie F. Beckerman issued Findings and Recommendation in this case on July 13, 2018. ECF 32. Judge Beckerman recommended that the Court grant in part and deny in part Defendants' motion to dismiss (ECF 24). Specifically, Judge Beckerman recommended that: (1) Plaintiff's federal claims against Washington County (Claims Two and Three) should be dismissed with leave to amend; (2) Plaintiff's Fourteenth Amendment claims (Claims Two and Three) should be dismissed as duplicative; and (3) Plaintiff's Claim Six should be dismissed as duplicative. Judge Beckerman also recommended that Plaintiff be granted leave to file an amended complaint within thirty days of the Court's order. No party has filed objections.

Under the Federal Magistrates Act (“Act”), the court may “accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). If a party files objections to a magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations, “the court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” *Id.*; Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3).

If no party objects, the Act does not prescribe any standard of review. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 152 (1985) (“There is no indication that Congress, in enacting [the Act], intended to require a district judge to review a magistrate’s report to which no objections are filed.”); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc) (holding that the court must review *de novo* magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations if objection is made, “but not otherwise”).

Although review is not required in the absence of objections, the Act “does not preclude further review by the district judge[] *sua sponte* . . . under a *de novo* or any other standard.” *Thomas*, 474 U.S. at 154. Indeed, the Advisory Committee Notes to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b) recommend that “[w]hen no timely objection is filed,” the court review the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations for “clear error on the face of the record.”

No party having made objections, this Court follows the recommendation of the Advisory Committee and reviews Judge Beckerman’s Findings and Recommendation for clear error on the face of the record. No such error is apparent. Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** Judge Beckerman’s Findings and Recommendation, ECF 32. Defendants’ motion to dismiss (ECF 24) is granted in part and denied in part. Specifically: (1) Plaintiff’s federal claims against Washington County (Claims Two and Three) are dismissed with leave to amend; (2) Plaintiff’s Fourteenth Amendment claims (Claims Two and Three) are dismissed as duplicative; and (3)

Plaintiff's Claim Six is dismissed as duplicative. Plaintiff has leave to file an amended complaint within thirty days of the Court's order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 31st day of July, 2018.

/s/ Michael H. Simon
Michael H. Simon
United States District Judge